REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-17 are active in the present application.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Sullivan for the indication that the previous rejection of Claim 2; the objection to the specification; the rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §101; the rejection of Claims 1, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph; and Claims 1, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, are withdrawn (paper number 18, pages 3-4). In addition, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Sullivan for the indication that Claims 16 and 17 have been allowed (paper number 18, page 6). Reconsideration of the remaining grounds of rejection is requested in view of the amendments above and the following comments.

The rejections of Claims 1, 9, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Culp et al and of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Culp et al, are obviated by amendment.

Applicants note that the present claims are drawn, in part, to polypeptides having a C-terminal heptapeptide sequence of: Cys-Phe-Trp-Lys-Tyr-Cys-Xaa, in which Xaa represents Val or Ile, in that it belongs to the urotensin II family and is selected from the group consisting of the human sequences SEQ ID NO:1-2, the rat sequences SEQ ID NO:30-32, and the mouse sequences SEQ ID NO:33-35 (see Claim 1 and 10).

Based on the outstanding rejection, it appears that the Examiner has found SEQ ID NOs: 1, 30-32, and 33-35 to be free of the art of record. However, the Examiner has maintained his rejection of SEQ ID NOs: 2 and 3 over Culp et al. In so doing, the Examiner has indicated that Culp et al discloses sequences having 100% homology with SEQ ID NOs: 2 and 3.

In the present amendment, Applicants have removed SEQ ID NO: 3 from the claims. With respect to SEQ ID NO: 2, Applicants note that the present claims are specifically drawn to the polypeptide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2 and not long polypeptides that happen to have a stretch that is identical to the claimed sequence. At no point do Culp et al disclose or suggest the specific sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2. In order for a reference to anticipate an invention, the reference "must teach every element of the claim" (MPEP §2131). Accordingly, Culp et al does not anticipate the invention as presently claimed.

Withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

The rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is obviated by amendment.

Consistent with the Examiner's indication with respect to the lack of clarity in present Claim 14, Applicants have amended this claim to specifically indicate that this claimed method is for selecting candidate anti-hypertensives by "determining the activity of *said candidate* anti-hypertensive against a urotensin II family member selected from the group consisting of the human sequences SEQ ID NO:1-2, the rat sequences SEQ ID NO:30-32, and the mouse sequences SEQ ID NO:33-35 as an antagonist." (see Claim 14).

In view of the amendment herein, Applicants request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

The rejection of Claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that the Examiner's enablement rejection of Claims 9 and 10 is completely without merit. Claim 9 provides a pharmaceutical composition containing the

inventive polypeptides and at least one pharmaceutically acceptable vehicle. Claim 10 provides a method of making a medicinal product comprising admixing at least one polypeptide according to claim 1 with at least one pharmaceutically acceptable vehicle. The Examiner has already found the inventive polypeptides to be enabled (paper number 18, page 3, lines 7-9).

Applicants remind the Examiner that MPEP § 2164.01 states:

> The test of enablement is whether one reasonably skilled in the art could make or use the invention from the disclosures in the patent coupled with information known in the art without undue experimentation.

Accordingly, based on the conceded enablement of the claimed polypeptide sequences (see Claim 1), the skilled artisan would certainly possess sufficient abilities on the basis of the present disclosure and the skill generally available in the art to admix the inventive polypeptides with a pharmaceutically acceptable vehicle without undue experimentation.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the presently claimed invention is fully enabled within the context of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The objection to the drawings is obviated by submission of formal drawings herewith. Applicants request that the Office indicate that the drawings submitted herewith have overcome the objection and that the drawings have been accepted.

Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 24,618

Vincent K. Shier, Ph.D.
Registration No. 50,552

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/03)